THE CURRENT STATE OF MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA AND RESEARCH THEMES ON CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM 2008–2010

Citizenship and Immigration Canada
BUILDING A STRONGER CANADA

Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada
BÂTIR UN CANADA PLUS FORT

Canada

This report is written by Professor Will Kymlicka, Queen's University. It has been commissioned by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to determine which multiculturalism issues are important nationwide and require the development of further research. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration or the Government of Canada.

Table of Contents

Abstract

In the spring of 2008, the Multiculturalism and Human Rights Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage commissioned six academics to conduct a socio-economic scan of the regions of Canada and to come up with research themes on Canadian multiculturalism that would be the focus of the branch for the next two years.[1]

The authors of the six regional reports conducted both literature reviews and interviews to help identify appropriate research themes for the upcoming 2008–2010 period. Each regional report identified 6 to 8 possible themes, for a total of 48 proposed themes. This report will both catalogue the regional proposals for research themes and attempt to consolidate them into a more manageable list.

Some of the 48 themes relate to issues that are unique to particular provinces or localities. In general, however, the reports exhibit a remarkable degree of consistency in their underlying themes and concerns. Indeed, despite the regional variations, there appears to be a broad consensus across the country on the importance of a handful of issues that are crucial to the future of multiculturalism in Canada. This report will attempt to articulate the consolidated research themes in a way that reflects these common concerns, while also leaving room for regional variations in how these topics are developed and studied.

While the regional authors were primarily asked to identify new research themes, they were also invited to comment on the research themes that were adopted for the previous period of 2006–2008. In this report, therefore, I will begin by summarizing some of their comments about the 2006–2008 themes, and then move on to their proposals for the 2008–2010 themes. The consolidation will be preceded by an essay on the current state of Canadian multiculturalism.

The ten new research themes for 2008–2010 are the following:

1. Adapting Multiculturalism to Religious Diversity
2. Racism and Discrimination
3. Labour Market Integration
4. Immigration Beyond the Metropolis
5. Implications of Security Issues for Multiculturalism
6. The Future of Multiculturalism
7. Relating Multiculturalism to Aboriginal Peoples
8. Vulnerable Groups: Women and Youth/Second Generation
9. Patterns of Ethnic Community Formation
10. Multicultural Readiness in Service Delivery

This paper has been commissioned by the Multiculturalism and Human Rights Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage to help inform decisions regarding research themes for the 2008–2010 period. More specifically, this paper is intended to supplement the series of six regional reports that explore emerging issues for multiculturalism at a

regional level in Canada. This paper aims to provide a broader national (and, indeed, international) overview of the "state of multiculturalism" in order to provide some background context for the regional reports.

Reviewing the debates on multiculturalism in Canada in the past few years, one is reminded of the words of Charles Dickens: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times." On the one hand, we have witnessed not only growing evidence of Canada's comparative advantage in the integration of immigrants, but also growing evidence that the multiculturalism policy has played an important role in this comparative success. For defenders of multiculturalism, the evidence of the policy's benefits has never been stronger. On the other hand, we are witnessing a worldwide retreat from multiculturalism, most observable in Western Europe, and many commentators argue that this is a harbinger of Canada's future as well. For critics, multiculturalism is an inherently flawed idea, and while these flaws may have emerged more quickly or starkly in Western Europe, they are starting to reveal themselves here in Canada as well.

In the first section, I will explore these dueling perspectives on multiculturalism – the celebratory and the condemnatory – and discuss how I believe we need to reframe the debate in order to move forward. There are real challenges confronting multiculturalism in Canada, but they are often ignored in the ritualized debate between supporters and critics of the policy.

I will begin with a short review of some of the new evidence of the benefits of the multiculturalism policy in Canada. I will then contrast this Canadian experience with the growing international backlash against multiculturalism, and how the international situation is leading many commentators to look for similar signs of emerging backlash and failure in Canada.

I believe that this attempt to read the Canadian experience in light of Western European trends is highly misleading, and indeed distracts us from the real issues. So I will conclude with a discussion of the sorts of challenges that I think are worthy of our attention, and that can help inform judgments about appropriate research topics for the 2008–2010 period.

In the second section, I will give an overview of the research themes for the period 2006–2008 and then list all the proposed research themes for every region. Lastly, I will list ten research themes that reflect ten distinct and important focuses of potential research for the 2008–2010 period, drawing on the excellent research and recommendations in the six regional reports.

The Current State of Multiculturalism in Canada

The New Evidence on Multiculturalism and Integration

Ever since its adoption in 1971, supporters and critics of multiculturalism have debated its impact on the social, economic and political integration of immigrants and visible or religious minorities and their children. Supporters argue that multiculturalism assists in the integration of immigrants and minorities, removing barriers to their participation in Canadian life and making them feel more welcome in Canadian society, leading to a stronger sense of belonging and pride in Canada. Critics argue that multiculturalism promotes ghettoization and balkanization, encouraging members of ethnic groups to look inward, and emphasizing the differences between groups rather than their shared rights or identities as Canadian citizens.

This is a highly ritualized debate whose basic terms have barely changed in over 35 years. One reason for the continuous recycling of this debate is that, until recently, we had little concrete evidence to test these dueling perspectives on the impact of multiculturalism. However, in the past few years, important new evidence has emerged. We can divide this evidence into two broad categories:

(a) evidence that the process of immigrant and minority integration is working better in Canada than in other countries; and
(b) evidence that the multiculturalism policy plays a positive role in this process.

On the first point, "integration" is a broad term, encompassing many different dimensions. For example:

- o economic integration into the labour market;
- o political integration into the electoral process and other forms of political participation;
- o social integration into the networks and spaces of civil society, from informal networks of friends and neighbours to membership in more formal organizations.

On all of these dimensions, there is growing evidence that immigrants to Canada and visible or religious minorities fare better than most, if not all, other Western democracies.

For example, recent research has revealed the following:

– There is a high level of mutual identification and acceptance among immigrants and native-born Canadians. Canadians view immigrants and demographic diversity as key parts of their own Canadian identity. Compared to every other Western democracy, Canadians are more likely to say that immigration is beneficial, less likely to believe that immigrants are prone to crime, and more likely to support multiculturalism and to view it as a source of pride. (For example, according to a series of "Focus Canada" polls conducted by Environics, support for multiculturalism among Canadians has increased over seven years: 85% of Canadians agreed that multiculturalism was important to

Canadian identity in 2003, compared to 74% in 1997.[2]) And immigrants and minorities return the compliment. They have a very high level of pride in Canada, and are proud most of all of Canada's freedom and democracy, and its multiculturalism (Adams 2007). This sort of mutual identification is a precondition for successful integration.

– In terms of political integration, compared to every other Western democracy, immigrants in Canada are (much) more likely to become citizens (Bloemraad 2006). Nor is this simply a desire to gain the safety or convenience of a Canadian passport. Compared to other countries, these naturalized immigrants are more likely to actually participate in the political process as voters, party members or even candidates for political office (Howe 2007). For example, there are more foreign-born citizens elected to Parliament in Canada than in any other country, both in absolute numbers and in terms of parity with their percentage of the population (Adams 2007: 70–74).

While the percentage of foreign-born Canadian members of the federal Parliament (13%) is lower than the percentage of foreign-born people in the overall population (19.3% in the 2001 census), this level of "demographic parity" is (far) higher than in the U.S. (2% foreign-born in the House of Representatives versus 14.7% in the population) or Australia (11% versus 23%) or any European country. (In fact, in France, most of the foreign-born members of Parliament are the children of French diplomats or of colonial settlers, not people of immigrant ethnic origin.)

Moreover, it's worth noting that the foreign-born MPs in Canada are not only, or even typically, elected in ethnic enclave ridings composed of their own co-ethnics (Adams 2007: 77–80). To be sure, there remain obstacles to the political participation of immigrants and ethnic minorities in Canada – well documented in Karen Bird's cross-national research project on this issue (Bird 2004, 2005, 2007). But, compared to other countries, political parties in Canada are more likely to actively recruit minority candidates and to run them in competitive ridings (and not just as token candidates). And once nominated, there is no evidence that voters in Canada discriminate against such candidates (Black and Erickson 2006). This again confirms the reciprocal nature of integration: immigrants want to participate in Canada's democratic process, and the broader electorate is open to being represented by immigrants.

– The children of immigrants have better educational outcomes in Canada than in any other Western democracy. Indeed, uniquely among Western countries, second-generation immigrants in Canada actually outperform children of non-immigrant parents (OECD 2006). Moreover, this is not solely due to the higher socio-economic background of immigrants in Canada. On the contrary, immigrant children from lower socio-economic backgrounds also do better in Canada than in other countries.

– There is an almost complete absence of immigrant or visible or religious minority ghettos in Canada. Today, as throughout Canadian history, immigrants often choose to live in neighbourhoods where co-ethnics already reside. But these areas of residential concentration do not exhibit the economic impoverishment, impaired mobility or social isolation that characterize ghettos in the U.S. or Europe. Ethnic neighbourhoods in

Canada are a stepping stone to integration, not a prison that impedes integration (Walks and Bourne 2006; Qadeer and Kumar 2006; Hiebert, Schuurman and Smith 2007).

– Compared to other countries, Canada has been less affected by the global surge in anti-Muslim sentiments and by the resulting polarization of ethnic relations. According to a survey conducted by Focus Canada in 2006, 83% of Canadians agree that Muslims make a positive contribution to Canada (Focus Canada 2006). International polls reveal that Muslims in Canada are less likely than Muslims in other countries to believe that their co-citizens are hostile to them. Moreover, Muslims have the same level of pride in Canada as other immigrants, and indeed are *more* likely than native-born Canadians to believe that the country is moving in the right direction: 91% of Muslims said this, compared to 71% of the general population (Adams 2007).

In short, there is growing evidence from cross-national studies that Canada outperforms other countries on a wide range of measures for immigrant and minority integration. This is not to say, of course, that there are no real problems facing immigrants and minorities in Canada; I will return to these below. But there is growing recognition of Canada's comparative advantage among scholars and international policy networks.

What is more disputed is whether multiculturalism plays any significant role in this comparative success. Critics of multiculturalism sometimes argue that Canada's record of integration is explained by other factors, such as the fact that Canada's immigrants tend to be more highly skilled than immigrants in other countries, and the fact that there is a relatively open labour market. In other words, immigrants bring with them high levels of human capital, and can more easily employ that human capital in the labour market compared to other countries. On this view, the presence of the multiculturalism policy contributes nothing to the successful integration of immigrants and minorities in Canada, and may in fact impede it (e.g., Goodhart 2008).

However, new research has helped to clarify the role that the multiculturalism policy plays within the broader processes of immigrant and minority integration. This research on the effects of multiculturalism has operated at two broad levels: individual identity and institutional design.

At the individual level, surveys indicate that multiculturalism provides a locus for the high level of mutual identification among native-born citizens and immigrants in Canada. In many countries, native-born citizens with a strong sense of national identity or national pride tend to be more distrustful of immigrants, who are seen as a threat to their cherished national identity (Sides and Citrin 2007). But the fact that Canada has officially defined itself as a multicultural nation means that immigrants are a constituent part of the nation that citizens feel pride in.

So multiculturalism serves as a link for native-born citizens from national identity to solidarity with immigrants and minorities. And conversely, multiculturalism provides a link through which immigrants and minorities come to identify with, and feel pride in, Canada. From their different starting points, there is convergence on high levels of pride

and identification with a multicultural conception of Canadian nationhood. Studies show that in the absence of multiculturalism, these links are more difficult to establish, and national identity is more likely to lead to intolerance and xenophobia (Esses et al. 2006; cf. Weldon 2006).

A new international study of acculturation has also confirmed the constructive role that multiculturalism plays in enabling healthy processes of individual acculturation (Berry et al. 2006). Many studies have shown that immigrants do best, both in terms of psychological well-being and sociocultural outcomes, when they are able to combine their ethnic identity with a new national identity. Scholars often call this an "integration orientation" as opposed to either an "assimilation orientation" (in which immigrants and minorities abandon their ethnic identity in order to adopt a new national identity) or a "separation orientation" (in which immigrants and minorities renounce the new national identity in order to maintain their ethnic identity).

Defenders of multiculturalism have long asserted that multiculturalism policies can encourage and enable this sort of integration orientation – indeed, this is known as the "multiculturalism hypothesis" (Berry, Kalin and Taylor 1977). Members of ethnic minorities will be more likely to identify with a new national identity if they feel their ethnic identity is publicly respected. We now have new evidence to support this hypothesis. The International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY), studying over 5,000 youth in 13 countries, has confirmed that countries with multiculturalism policies encourage the development of this integration orientation, with better outcomes (Berry et al. 2006).

At the institutional level, we also have new evidence of the role that multiculturalism plays in creating more inclusive and equitable public institutions. For example, the massive OECD study that established Canada's comparative advantage in educating immigrant students emphasized that a crucial factor in this success was the presence of specific policies to address issues of cultural and linguistic diversity in the school population – policies that, in the Canadian context, have emerged under the rubric of multiculturalism (OECD 2006). These diversity policies help to explain why the children of immigrants do better in Canada, even when one takes into account the skills, education and income of their parents.

Similarly, multiculturalism has been shown to play an important role in making Canada's political process more inclusive. Consider the study conducted by Irene Bloemraad, comparing the political integration of immigrants in the U.S. and Canada (Bloemraad 2006). She examines Vietnamese immigrants in Boston and Toronto, who provide an interesting "natural experiment" in the effects of multiculturalism policies. There are virtually no relevant differences in the demographic characteristics of the Vietnamese immigrants who ended up in Toronto rather than Boston – they arrived with comparable levels of education, work experience, language fluency, and so on. Yet the Vietnamese in Toronto have a much stronger sense of Canadian citizenship, and are more actively participating in Canadian public life.

There are of course many possible explanations for this difference other than the presence of stronger multiculturalism policies (e.g., labour markets, political party structures, etc.), but Bloemraad systematically canvasses these alternative explanations and concludes that multiculturalism policies are indeed a crucial part of the story. These policies encourage and enable the Vietnamese community to participate more quickly and more effectively in mainstream Canadian institutions, by facilitating the self-organization of the community, by creating new cadres of community leaders who are familiar with Canadian institutions and practices, by creating new mechanisms of consultation and participation and, more generally, by creating a more welcoming environment.

According to Bloemraad, the same pattern applies to Portuguese immigrants in Toronto and Boston as well – they arrived with similar demographic characteristics, but the Portuguese immigrants in Toronto have integrated better into Canadian citizenship, due in large part to Canadian multiculturalism (Bloemraad 2006). Subsequent research by Bloemraad has shown that multiculturalism policies in other countries have also had a positive effect on citizenship (Kesler and Bloemraad 2008).

If we put these various findings together, they push us toward some clear conclusions. I believe that the 35-year debate in Canada between those who argue that multiculturalism promotes civic integration and those who argue that it promotes ethnic isolation can now safely be put to rest. These recent studies – all of which were produced from 2006 to 2008 – provide strong evidence that multiculturalism in Canada promotes integration and citizenship, both through its effect on attitudes, self-understanding and identity at the individual level and through its effect on institutions at the social level.

The Global Backlash

One might have expected these research findings about the beneficial effects of multiculturalism to be widely discussed in the media and among public commentators. In reality, the findings have been almost entirely ignored – few, if any, of these studies have received any significant public attention.

Instead, what has dominated the debate in Canada in the 2006–2008 period is the spectre of backlash and retreat from multiculturalism. This may seem odd, given the findings I have just reported. But it is important to remember that Canada is not an island unto itself – it is part of an international community that has been struggling with issues of ethnic and racial diversity. And in much of the rest of the world, there is a widespread perception that multiculturalism has "failed" and that it is time to "pull back" from multiculturalism, which has been taken "too far."

Perhaps the most vivid example of this retreat from multiculturalism is the Netherlands. It adopted perhaps the most ambitious set of multiculturalism policies in Western Europe in the 1980s. Yet, starting in the 1990s, the country started to cut back on these policies and then abandoned them almost entirely in the 2000s. Multiculturalism in the Netherlands has been replaced with fairly harsh and coercive "civic integration" policies which (to critics at least) appear to be indistinguishable from old-fashioned assimilation.

The Dutch case is now widely viewed as the prototypical example of "the failure of multiculturalism" and is cited in other European countries as grounds for retreating from their own multiculturalism policies, or for not adopting such policies in the first place. We see this, for example, in Britain, where the New Left has largely abandoned its commitment to multiculturalism. And several European countries that had once considered multiculturalism are now following the Dutch model of adopting coercive "civic integration" policies – e.g., Austria and Germany (for an overview of these developments in Western Europe, see Joppke 2007). And while this backlash is strongest in Europe, we see a similar trend in Australia, where the conservative Howard government disavowed multiculturalism and cut back on its funding (although some of the slack was then picked up by enhanced multiculturalism policies at the provincial level, which were governed by the Labour Party).

This global backlash and retreat is now so widespread that even international inter-governmental organizations that had once championed multiculturalism are now backing off from it. For example, the Council of Europe recently declared that multiculturalism is simply the flip side of assimilation, equally based on the assumption of an irreconcilable opposition between majority and minority, leading to "communal segregation and mutual incomprehension" (Council of Europe 2008: 10).

In this European debate, multiculturalism is blamed for a variety of ills. In particular, it is said to have promoted:

- the residential ghettoization and social isolation of immigrants (Cantle Report 2001);
- increased stereotyping, and hence prejudice and discrimination between ethnic groups (Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2007);
- political radicalism, particularly among Muslim youth;
- the perpetuation of illiberal practices among immigrant groups, often involving restricting the rights and liberties of girls and women (Wikan 2002).

According to critics, these problems have been worsening since the 1980s, but were ignored due to the naïve and indeed pernicious ideology of multiculturalism, which assumed that it was somehow "natural" that society should be divided into separate and disconnected ethnic groups, each with its own territorial space, political values and cultural traditions. As a result, European societies were "sleepwalking to segregation," leading to an ethnic crisis (Phillips 2005). Citizens applauded themselves for their tolerant "live-and-let-live" attitude toward immigrants while ignoring the growing levels of segregation and marginalization.

This, in short, is the dominant narrative about multiculturalism in Europe. Multiculturalism, it is said, has been tried and has failed, with serious social consequences. It is now repudiated, both by individual countries and by pan-European organizations. The only remedy now is to insist that newcomers give priority to their new national identity over their inherited ethnic or religious identities – they must agree to be "Dutch first," at least in relation to public life, and to renounce claims for the institutional

accommodation or political expression of their ethnic identities. Ethnic identities, if they are to be preserved at all, must only be expressed in private life and not provide the basis for political claims to multiculturalism.

There are several questions that can be raised about this European narrative. If we look below the surface, we find that several de facto multiculturalist programs remain in place in several European countries even when their governments disavow the term – the "retreat" from multiculturalism is more rhetorical than real. (This is arguably true of the U.K., for example.) And the claim that multiculturalism is causally responsible for these social ills of segregation, prejudice, radicalism and oppression is highly debatable. I am not aware of any evidence which suggests that these social ills are worse in European countries that adopted multiculturalism policies (such as the Netherlands, the U.K. and Sweden) than in European countries that did not adopt such policies (such as Denmark, France and Austria). Indeed, I think the evidence suggests the contrary: these social ills are less prominent in countries with multiculturalism policies.[3]

However, for the purposes of this paper, what matters is not whether the European narrative is an accurate account of European realities. What matters, rather, is how this European narrative has come to influence debates in Canada.

Is Europe the Future for Canada?

The European narrative is so powerful that it has inevitably filtered back into Canadian debates. Many Canadian commentators, persuaded that multiculturalism has indeed failed in Europe, have started to look for evidence that Canada is following the same trajectory. One well-known example is Allan Gregg's 2006 article entitled "Identity Crisis: Multiculturalism: A Twentieth-Century Dream Becomes a Twenty-First Century Conundrum," published in *The Walrus*. Gregg begins with the Dutch case, blaming multiculturalism for Holland's increasingly polarized ethnic relations, and then suggests that Canada too is showing signs of these social ills. Gregg argues that in Canada, as in the Netherlands, the elite consensus on a feel-good multiculturalism is blinding us to the reality of growing ethnic divides and animosities. Similar arguments have now been made by many other commentators, such as Margaret Wente, Michael Bliss, Robert Fulford, Jack Granatstein, and others.

These commentaries all have a similar structure, which we could summarize this way:

- multiculturalism has demonstrably failed in Europe, producing greater segregation, greater stereotyping and prejudice, and greater polarization;
- these failures are inherent in the very idea of multiculturalism, which is built on stereotypical and isolationist assumptions about ethnic groups;
- while many Canadians think they are immune to these European problems, we can see growing evidence that the problems are also emerging in Canada (as indeed they inevitably must, given multiculturalism's inherent flaws);

- the remedy is either the abolition of multiculturalism, or perhaps a "post-multiculturalism," which is said to avoid the excesses of multiculturalism without reverting to the sort of harsh assimilationism that we see in many European countries.

In short, on this view, Europe has done us the service of revealing the inherent flaws of multiculturalism, and we need to learn that lesson quickly in order to avoid the sorts of ethnic and religious animosities and divisions that are so visible in Europe.

It is this motif – Europe as the harbinger of Canada's future – which has dominated the public debate on multiculturalism in Canada in the past few years. Many commentators are convinced that Canada is following in Europe's footsteps, and so are constantly monitoring the environment to find the slightest evidence that Canada is witnessing the same sort of segregation, isolation, prejudice and polarization that we see in Europe. The important new evidence I described earlier about multiculturalism's success in Canada has been largely ignored by the media and instead, attention has focused on any fact, event or study that seems to suggest that Canada is replicating the European experience of failed multiculturalism.

Is there in fact any evidence that Canada is experiencing the sorts of social ills that are blamed on multiculturalism in Europe? I cannot discuss all the bits and pieces of evidence that commentators invoke, but let me mention a few of the more familiar examples, and why I think they are often misleading.

(a) Many commentators point to Statistics Canada statistics about the growing number of "ethnic enclaves" as evidence of increasing European-style (or American-style) ethnic ghettoization (e.g., *The Globe and Mail* articles by Marina Jimenez). In my view, this is a red herring – an artifact of poorly defined Statistics Canada categories, combined with a misunderstanding of the historical record of immigrant settlement (visible minority immigrants today are actually less residentially concentrated than, say, the Italians were), and an even deeper misunderstanding of what "ghettos" are.

   The multiple errors involved in equating "ethnic enclaves" (as measured by Statistics Canada) with "ghettos" have been ably dissected in several recent studies which show that Canada's ethnic neighbourhoods have virtually nothing in common with the *banlieues* of Paris.

(b) Some commentators have pointed to cases of Islamic radicalism in Canada, including the "Toronto 18," as evidence of European-style ethnic polarization. After all, these are "home-grown" extremists who have grown up in social contexts that were committed to multiculturalism (e.g., the schools, hospitals, police force, media, etc.), and yet they clearly did not internalize any loyalty to Canada or to its norms of democracy, peace and tolerance.

   In my view, while the problem of Islamic extremism is real enough, blaming it on multiculturalism is a serious mistake. The reality is that Islamic extremism is found in all Western societies, whether or not they have multiculturalism policies, as

disaffected youth are exposed to global jihadist ideas and networks. No free, democratic society can entirely prevent this sort of exposure (through the Internet, travel, private associations, etc.). What societies can do, however, is try to minimize the number of disaffected youth who would be attracted to it, and to try to enlist the support and cooperation of Muslim organizations in combatting extremism. And on this score, as we have seen, Canada has done better than other countries, since Muslims in Canada are less likely than Muslims in other countries to believe that they are treated with hostility, and are more likely to feel pride in the country.

Moreover, the multiculturalism policy is at least partly responsible for these results since it creates both individual identity links with the country and institutional links with Muslim organizations (Keeble 2005). The question of how security agencies should best monitor extremism is of course a very important one, but we will go badly off course if we misinterpret isolated cases of extremism as evidence of any general trend toward ethnic polarization in Canada. Indeed, operating on that false assumption is likely to be self-fulfilling: if Muslims who view themselves as proud Canadians are treated with distrust by public authorities, these Muslims in turn may become distrustful of Canadian society.

(c) Some commentators have pointed to the persistence of illiberal practices among some immigrant and minority groups as evidence that they are failing to integrate into Canada's liberal-democratic norms. This issue emerged, for example, in discussions of Aqsa Parvez's case – the December 2007 "honour killing" of a Muslim girl by her father for not wearing the hijab. But here again, we need to get beyond isolated cases to look at the general trends. Cases of honour killings, coerced marriages or female genital mutilation can be found in every Western democracy, whether or not it has multiculturalism policies. There is no evidence that this problem is worse in multiculturalist countries (i.e., countries that do have formal multiculturalism policies and laws in place) like Canada than in non-multiculturalist countries like France or Germany.

In any event, the occurrence of such cases should not be taken as evidence of any general trend toward the rejection of liberal-democratic values. On the contrary, a recent study shows that immigrants in Canada, regardless of their religious affiliation, converge toward the Canadian norm on what the authors call "Charter values," including the rights of gays and women (Soroka, Johnston and Banting 2007). Indeed, as I noted earlier, what immigrants are most proud of in Canada is its democratic norms (Adams 2007). There is simply no evidence that immigrants and their children in Canada are not internalizing liberal-democratic values. The question of how best to prevent and prosecute such crimes is a very important one, but we will go badly off course if we misinterpret these individual acts as evidence of a general failure of political integration among entire ethnic groups.

(d) Other commentators suggest that recent studies of the attitudes of second-generation visible minorities reveal evidence of growing polarization. One frequently cited study is that of Reitz and Banerjee (2007), which showed that second-generation visible

minorities express lower levels of "belonging" to Canada, compared not only to their white counterparts, but also to their own immigrant parents. Although Reitz and Banerjee themselves do not describe this as a harbinger of European-style polarization, this is how their study was often reported in the media.

But here again, caution is needed. The findings about "feelings of belonging" in Canada are indeed worrisome. But if we look instead at questions of "feelings of pride" in Canada, we find a very different story. Visible minorities, including the second generation, express very high levels of pride in Canada on a par with white Canadians (Soroka, Johnston and Banting 2007).

It is not immediately obvious how to make sense of these different results, but whatever the explanation for the divergence between pride and belonging, it suggests that lower expressions of "belonging" are not necessarily evidence of deep alienation or ethnic polarization. Moreover, it is important to note that, while the scores on belonging are lower for second-generation visible minorities than for whites, they are still impressively high: the median response for all visible minority groups was over 8 on a 10-point scale. The vast majority of the members of all visible minority groups have a strong sense of belonging. And it is worth noting that these median scores for visible minorities are all higher than for francophone Québecers. If there is a problem of a lack of belonging in Canada, it is with the Québécois, not visible minorities.

(e) Finally, some commentators have pointed to Quebec's recent "reasonable accommodation" debate as evidence of growing polarization. Stirred up by media reports of "excessive" accommodations of minorities, newspapers and radio shows in Quebec were dominated for a period of time by calls for a new, tougher approach to immigrants and minorities, and surveys showed widespread support in Quebec for this idea. For the first time in many years in Canada, a major political party (the Action Démocratique du Québec [ADQ]) ran on an anti-immigrant and anti-multiculturalism platform, and this proved to be a successful tactic, increasing their share of the vote and the seats. To avoid further loss of electoral support, both the Quebec Liberals and the Parti Québécois engaged in their own "get tough" rhetoric, denouncing "excessive" multiculturalism. (This dynamic of mainstream parties having to get tough to avoid losing support to an anti-immigrant party is of course precisely what happened in many Western European countries.)

For some commentators, this was the first crack in the wall – the first real sign of a European-style retreat from multiculturalism, and a harbinger of what was likely to happen in the rest of Canada. Indeed, federal Cabinet memorandums speculated about the possibility of a similar backlash against multiculturalism spreading across the country. And yet, two years later, we see no evidence that this backlash is spreading. No other province has had the same explosive debate about religious accommodations, or the same attempt to win votes by appealing to anti-immigrant views, or the same calls for abandoning multiculturalism policies. So far at least, it appears that the backlash against multiculturalism has largely been restricted to

Quebec.

This is not surprising, since multiculturalism has always been less popular in Quebec than in other provinces, largely due to Québecers' perception of themselves as a vulnerable minority within the anglophone sea of North America (I will return to this issue below), and partly because the anti-multiculturalist debates in France have more resonance in Quebec than in the rest of the country. But even within Quebec, it is now clear that the impetus of the anti-multiculturalist movement has ebbed. The Bouchard-Taylor report has shown that the original media reports of "excessive" accommodation were often wildly inaccurate, and it concludes that there is no need for a dramatic revision of the existing policy of accommodation.

While not everyone agrees with the Bouchard-Taylor report, the issue has subsided, and support for the ADQ has dropped. It now looks more like a case of temporary "moral panic" than the sort of sustained backlash that we have witnessed in, say, the Netherlands, where government reports called for dramatic changes to integration policy, and where anti-immigrant parties permanently changed the political landscape.

In short, the various attempts to find signs of European-style problems in Canada are all, I believe, misleading. In fact, one could argue that many of these attempts were politically motivated. They have typically been advanced by people (such as Robert Fulford or Michael Bliss) who have always been opposed to multiculturalism, even before the European retreat from multiculturalism. This is not a case of people deciding whether to support or oppose multiculturalism based on new evidence. Rather, long-time critics of multiculturalism have jumped on the European anti-multiculturalist bandwagon and have hoped to ride it into Canada, desperately looking for any shred of evidence that can be (mis)interpreted as proof that Canada is falling into European-style patterns of ethnic animosity and division. If we look at the evidence dispassionately, however, it is clear that ethnic relations in Toronto are not like those in Paris, Amsterdam or Bradford.

Indeed, this is precisely the conclusion reached by the Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) in its 2007 publication *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. Noting the increasing tendency for commentators to read the Canadian situation in light of European trends, the IRPP decided to convene a major research project to examine in a systematic way whether "the Canadian model" was indeed facing the same troubles witnessed in Western Europe. Having examined various facets of the issue – economic, political and social – the IRPP team concluded that

… there is little evidence of the deep social segregation feared in parts of Europe … Canada is not "sleepwalking into segregation." There is no justification for a U-turn in multiculturalism policies comparable to that underway in some European countries. (Banting, Courchene and Seidle 2007: 660, 681)

The Real (and Unresolved) Issues

Now that I have sketched the current state of the public debate and some of its misconceptions, we can turn to examining the research and analysis contained in the six regional reports that were commissioned by the research arm of the Multiculturalism and Human Rights Branch at the federal Department of Canadian Heritage. Each of these reports contains both an overview of regional trends regarding the situation of minorities and recommendations regarding themes for future research.

The regional reports make clear that, while our problems are not Europe's problems, we have no grounds for complacency. Indeed, the research in these reports makes it clear that there are a number of real issues that require serious attention. In this brief concluding section, I would like to flag a few of these issues, focusing on some of the dimensions that are often overlooked.

(1) **Bringing religion into multiculturalism**: All the regional reports agree that the place of religious diversity within multiculturalism has not yet been adequately debated or explored, and I have argued this myself elsewhere (Kymlicka 2007, 2008). The heated debates on religious family law arbitration and the funding of religious schools in Ontario, and the reasonable accommodation debate in Quebec, show that religion is now the most controversial domain of multiculturalism. The Bouchard-Taylor report is perhaps the first sustained public report on the topic in Canada, and while it is focused on Quebec, I think its analysis is relevant nationally. In particular, it argues that while the existing constitutional and legislative framework of "reasonable accommodation" and "open secularism" in Canada is largely appropriate, more work needs to be done in helping front-line workers and officials who face the daily task of actually implementing the policy and managing the debates it raises.

This is an issue of "multicultural preparedness." It is unrealistic (and undesirable) to expect the Supreme Court to adjudicate every single case of religious claims (like the kirpan case), but nor do we want these issues to become fodder for yellow journalism, as happened in Quebec. We need to "normalize" these issues, establishing effective mechanisms for advice, consultation and decision making that stakeholders can turn to without having to resort to either the courts or the media. Such mechanisms exist in the case of ethnic diversity and race relations, but are underdeveloped in the case of religious diversity, so that we are continually having to react to crises rather than proactively managing the issues.

(2) **The media**: This raises the issue of the role of the media, which was noted as a concern in several regional reports. In my view, the role of the media in Canada is a "glass half-full or half-empty" story. On the one hand, compared to most other countries, the mainstream media in Canada have largely avoided engaging in minority or immigrant bashing. Compared to tabloids in London and Rome, for example, the main newspapers in Toronto do not run endless cover stories on the alleged criminality of particular ethnic groups, or on the possibility of being "swamped" with unwanted migrants or bogus asylum seekers.

Similarly, it is difficult to imagine Canadian newspapers deliberately setting out to provoke Muslim animosity by commissioning anti-Muslim cartoons, the way the Danish editor has candidly admitted to wanting to start a "culture war." Most professional journalists in Canada have internalized a certain level of responsibility – or just political correctness – on these issues. On the other hand, there have been cases (often opinion editorials) that have been gratuitously offensive or misleading, giving rise to human rights complaints, and there is clearly room for improvement in the way the media handle various issues.

But what is the right forum for addressing this problem? I suspect that human rights commissions are not necessarily the right forum, and we need to rethink how to promote and monitor responsible journalism on this issue. It is right and proper, I believe, for hate speech to be a criminal offence; it is also right and proper that there be standards of professional conduct for journalists, with regulatory bodies and avenues for individuals to complain about violations of these standards.

But in many cases, what is really required is a broader public debate about editorial policy and human rights commissions are not the appropriate forum for that debate. Indeed, it is possible that the pursuit of complaints before human rights commissions is actually counter-productive, exacerbating the antagonism between the media and certain minority groups. In any event, it is undeniable that the media play a vital role in shaping public attitudes, and so the link between multiculturalism and the media deserves a fresh look.

(3) **The relationship between multiculturalism and the other two main dimensions of ethnocultural diversity in Canada: French Canadians and Aboriginal peoples.** Diversity policies in Canada today typically operate within three distinct "silos" with separate laws, constitutional provisions and government departments dealing with (a) multiculturalism in response to ethnic diversity arising from immigration, (b) federalism and bilingualism in response to the French fact; and (c) Aboriginal rights for First Nations. (I develop this "silo" metaphor in relation to Canada's diversity policies in Kymlicka 2007b.)

In many respects, it is inevitable and appropriate that these three policy domains and frameworks be distinguished. No single set of diversity policies can encompass the distinct historical legacies and current needs of Canada's diverse groups. However, it is equally important to clarify how these three dimensions interact. It would be regrettable, indeed tragic, if the three policy frameworks were seen as operating at cross purposes, as if anyone who supports Aboriginal rights or Quebec's national aspirations must reject multiculturalism, or vice versa. This was an important issue in the Quebec debate on reasonable accommodation.

Many Quebec intellectuals and politicians continue to believe that the federal multiculturalism policy, as it is currently worded in the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, implicitly or explicitly plays down Quebec's national aspirations. In my view,

this is a mistaken interpretation, since the federal multiculturalism policy is fully compatible with a special status for Quebec. However, it is fair to say that the issue of how multiculturalism relates to bilingualism, federalism and Québécois nationalism has not been clearly addressed.

Similarly, important issues are arising about the relationship between multiculturalism and urban Aboriginals in several Western cities. Immigrants and Aboriginals increasingly live in close proximity in various neighbourhoods, and while constitutionally speaking they may fall under different laws and regulations, the practical reality is that they often share public services and public space. Aboriginal leaders have sometimes viewed multiculturalism with suspicion, and while here again I think there is no inherent opposition between the federal multiculturalism policy and Aboriginal rights, more work needs to be done to explain how they work together.

This in turn will require overcoming the perception that these policies are only relevant to ethnic groups, francophones and Aboriginal peoples respectively, as if other Canadians had no stake or involvement in issues of multiculturalism, bilingualism, federalism and Aboriginal rights. Rather, we need to explain how these policies aim to build relations of inclusive citizenship that encompass all Canadians, and that we all have a stake in ensuring the success of these three sets of diversity policies.

(4) **Racism and discrimination**: One area where multiculturalism and Aboriginal issues overlap concerns racism and discrimination. The issues of racism and discrimination were raised in all the regional reports and clearly are a profound challenge. But as the example of Aboriginal peoples shows, the challenges of racism are not necessarily captured in our inherited terminology of "visible minorities." While Aboriginal peoples are not counted as visible minorities, they clearly are victims of racism. And even within the category of "visible minorities," there are important differences in the nature of the racism they encounter.

Several authors have long argued that anti-Black racism is qualitatively different from that suffered by other visible minorities. And, more recently, various authors have argued that anti-Muslim prejudice is also a very distinct form of racialization. If we only look at aggregate statistics about how "visible minorities" are faring, we may lose sight of these important initiatives – anti-racism initiatives might be working well for some groups even as prejudice is increasing against other groups.

We know from other countries that anti-racism initiatives can sometimes get locked into outdated or inappropriate categories. For example, for a long period of time, British anti-racism initiatives treated anti-Muslim prejudice as if it were just another form of anti-Black prejudice. We need to make sure that anti-racism and anti-discrimination programs are tracking these differentiated and evolving patterns of racialization.

(5) **Economic conditions**: Finally, and perhaps most importantly, all the regional reports discuss the growing evidence that the economic performance of recent immigrants is declining. Compared to earlier cohorts, immigrants today are taking longer to catch up to native-born Canadians in their earnings, and are at higher risk of poverty.

The causes of this trend have been debated and tested in numerous studies, by Statistics Canada and others, and I have little to add to their analysis, except to note that many of these causes seem to lie outside the jurisdiction of the federal multiculturalism policy, relating instead to issues such as professional accreditation, the evaluation of foreign job experience, language training, and mismatches between immigrant selection and actual labour market needs (e.g., recruiting large numbers of IT specialists just before the IT bubble burst).

The key point, however, and here I return to my starting point, is that whatever the causes and remedies, this trend is fundamentally different from the sort of "underclass" phenomenon that is discussed in Europe. While immigrants are facing increasing barriers in using their human capital – at a high cost both to themselves and to Canadian society in general – Canada is not becoming a society that is polarized between a wealthy, educated white majority and impoverished, unskilled racialized minorities, as in France and the Netherlands. The declining economic performance of immigrants exists alongside much more positive trends regarding the social and political integration of immigrants, reflected for example in educational outcomes, intermarriage rates, political participation rates and shared feelings of national pride.

The net result of these trends is neither the utopia celebrated by some defenders of multiculturalism nor the "sleepwalking to segregation" scenario predicted by critics. It is rather a complex bundle of factors, each of which needs to be examined on its own terms. The regional reports provide a number of helpful suggestions about how to study these dynamics. The first step in that direction, however, is to set aside the pervasive tendency to look at the Canadian experience through the lens of the European backlash against multiculturalism.

Research Themes on Canadian Multiculturalism

Overview of the 2006–2008 Research Themes

During the 2006–2008 period, the following six themes were chosen as priorities for research by the Research Group of the Multiculturalism and Human Rights Branch.

1) Social inclusion/exclusion
2) 2017 projections
3) Applied policy research
4) Racism, discrimination and post-multiculturalism
5) Religious diversity
6) Security in a pluralistic society

In general, the authors of the regional reports felt that these themes were important and valid, and that future research should continue to address them. However, a number of suggestions were made about how to make the themes more focused. Indeed, as we will see, many of the proposed new themes are, in effect, attempts to rearticulate these earlier themes in ways that make more explicit the underlying issues and concerns.

Social inclusion/exclusion: Some of the regional reports found that the term "social inclusion" was too amorphous. After all, virtually all of multiculturalism is essentially about social inclusion. It was therefore suggested that the research themes focus on specific issues of inclusion and exclusion, whether in terms of specific vulnerable groups (e.g., youth, Muslims) or in terms of specific social processes (e.g., job discrimination, social isolation, media stereotyping).

2017 projections: Some of the regional reports suggested that this theme was useful when it was adopted in 2006, but that it was now increasingly unnecessary or out of date. The original emphasis on the 2017 projections was useful in giving Canadians a wake-up call about the dramatic demographic changes that were occurring in our country. However, that wake-up call has now been well publicized, not least because of the publicity surrounding the release of the 2006 census data. As a result, it was suggested that we now need to move beyond demographic projections to examine the substantive policy issues that are raised by these trends. In particular, we need to examine our "multicultural readiness" for an increasingly diverse society in terms of education, health care, urban planning, and so on.

Applied policy research: Some of the regional reports suggested that all research commissioned by the Research Group, on all the research themes, be "applied research," and hence that it be a principle that applies to all the research themes rather than a separate research theme. (This comment may reflect a misunderstanding of the administrative reasons within Canadian Heritage for having a separate theme on applied research.)

Racism, discrimination and post-multiculturalism: Some of the regional reports suggested that this theme combined (or conflated) two distinct issues that were worth separating. On the one hand, there are a set of questions about our current policies on

racism and racial discrimination, and how they can be made more effective. On the other hand, there is a more speculative debate on the future of multiculturalism as a concept or model, and whether inherited ideas of multiculturalism need to be replaced with new, post-multicultural approaches in an era of "hyper-diversity." The regional reports proposed that more concrete and urgent issues of racism and discrimination be separated from more speculative and theoretical issues about the future of multiculturalism, and that both issues be treated as separate research themes.

Religious diversity: This was the one theme from the 2006–2008 period that met with universal support among all the regional authors. There was a unanimous sense that issues of religious diversity are of growing importance in Canada, and that the success of Canadian multiculturalism (and indeed of Canada as a country) depends on improving our understanding of the challenges raised by this diversity. But it was equally emphasized that issues of religion cannot be separated from older issues of racism, and that one of the most important challenges we face is precisely the complex interaction between racial prejudice and religious intolerance.

Security in a pluralistic society: All the regional reports acknowledged the increased salience of security issues in a post-9/11 world, and the obligation of the government to monitor and protect Canadians against these threats. However, there was a concern expressed that "securitizing" issues of immigration and multiculturalism could have unfortunate, and indeed counter-productive, effects. If immigrants and visible or religious minorities feel that they are being stigmatized by the government (or by other citizens) as security threats, and that they are not trusted to behave as loyal Canadian citizens, then they are likely to withdraw from public life and feel more alienated from Canadian institutions. The net result may be to create precisely the sort of conditions of isolation and distrust that breed radicalism. The regional reports, therefore, emphasized that issues of security needed to be carefully framed to avoid any unfair targeting or stigmatizing of particular groups.

In short, the regional reports viewed the previous 2006–2008 research themes as identifying real issues of enduring importance, but several authors suggested that the new research themes for 2008–2010 should both tighten the focus (e.g., replace the wide scope of "social inclusion" with more specific forms or mechanisms of exclusion) and draw out some of their interconnections (e.g., exploring the link between religious diversity and racial discrimination). Their proposals for doing so are discussed in the next section.

Proposed 2008–2010 Themes from the Regional Reports

As I noted earlier, the regional reports propose a total of 48 research themes for the 2008–2010 period. Here is the complete list of these themes, region by region, moving from east to west. I have translated the first 20 themes from their original French versions. (See also the table for the list in tabular form.)

The Atlantic Region[4]
1) Social inclusion, social bases of respect and social justice
2) Exclusion and marginalization of youth
3) Health, ethnicity and visible minorities
4) Religious diversity and racial integration
5) Immigration into rural and francophone communities
6) Data gathering and projections for 2006–2031

Quebec[5]
1) The contribution of visible and religious minorities to Quebec culture
2) Socio-economic integration and participation of second-generation immigrants, religious minorities and visible minorities
3) Racism and racial discrimination
4) The socio-economic conditions of visible and religious minorities
5) The role of language (mother tongue and second language) in the process of labour market integration
6) The integration strategies of visible and religious minorities in Quebec
7) [Comparing] visible minorities and religious minorities
8) Youth from visible or religious minorities, and second-generation Canadian youth
9) The elderly in visible and religious minorities
10) Women in visible and religious minorities
11) Poverty, exclusion and residential segregation
12) The contribution of social policy to the socio-professional integration of visible and religious minorities
13) The impact of the media on the development and spread of stereotypes and racial prejudice
14) The specific case of Quebec

Ontario
1) Multiculturalism for the twenty-first century
2) Institutional self-sufficiency of ethnic, religious and visible minority groups
3) Public reception of multiculturalism
4) Media and multiculturalism
5) Regional issues: Toronto, Ottawa-Gatineau / mid-size cities / towns / northern Ontario

Manitoba and Saskatchewan
1) Visible minority and religious minority community relations with Prairie Aboriginal peoples
2) The role of visible and religious minorities in the evolution of rural and northern communities
3) French-speaking visible minorities in the Prairies
4) Responding to contemporary phenomena: visible minority and religious minority integration in the Prairies
5) Protecting and promoting the history of Canadian national heritage
6) The status of women in visible and religious minority communities in the Prairies
7) Public performances of identity: food, festivals, holidays and holy days in visible and religious minority communities

Alberta[6]
1) Strategies for tackling racism and discrimination
2) Religion and inclusion
3) Economic participation and standard of living
4) Francophone and Aboriginal populations in Alberta
5) Youth, seniors and multiculturalism
6) The future of Canadian multiculturalism policy

Yukon, Nunavut and Northwest Territories
1) Multicultural initiatives coordinated with Aboriginal initiatives
2) Economic growth and labour market migration
3) Logistics of data collection and program management

British Columbia
1) Economic participation and lifestyles correlation
2) Multiculturalism in social services policy and planning
3) Youth at risk: multiculturalism, education and violence prevention
4) International geopolitics and domestic responses: Implications for multiculturalism
5) Racism and discrimination: implementation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism
6) Meaningful engagement with the 2010 Olympic Games
7) Multiculturalism: Future policy evolutions

It would obviously be impossible to discuss each of these 48 proposals in depth, particularly since many of the authors provide detailed explanations for their choice of themes, including suggestions for specific research initiatives and activities. What I propose to do instead is to highlight what I take to be some of the common themes that underpin these diverse proposals, and to consolidate them into a more manageable list.

As I noted earlier, the list contains a number of proposals that are clearly region specific. For example, "meaningful engagement with the 2010 Olympics" is obviously most relevant for British Columbia. Similarly, the fact that many visible minorities in the Territories are not permanent residents but on short-term contracts gives issues of multiculturalism a very unique flavour in that region. However, alongside these regional

concerns, we can also identify a number of themes that recur throughout the length and breadth of the country. Even a cursory glance at the 48 themes reveals a number of core issues that appear in several of the regional lists.

In the next section, I will list what I see as the ten most important such themes raised in the regional reports. These ten themes are interrelated, and some questions or topics recur under more than one heading (as indeed was true of the 2006–2008 themes). However, while they blur into each other at the margins, they also reflect ten distinct and important focuses of potential research.

Ten Proposed Research Themes for Canada

1. **Adapting multiculturalism to religious diversity**
   As I noted earlier, there was unanimous support in all the regional reports for the importance of further research on religious diversity in Canada. Several more specific research questions were raised under this heading, but three in particular are worth noting: (a) Traditionally, multiculturalism in Canada has worked with and through organizations defined along lines of ethnicity (e.g., the Canadian Ukrainian Congress) and race (e.g., the Urban Alliance on Race Relations). How are organizations and social movements defined along lines of religion similar to, or different from, those based on ethnicity and race? How do multiculturalism programs and consultation procedures initially designed for issues of ethnicity and race need to be revised to deal with religion?; (b) Insofar as multiculturalism does adapt to address issues of religious diversity, how does this relate to principles of "secularism" that underpin contemporary liberal-democratic principles of government?; and (c) Does the principle of "reasonable accommodation" provide an adequate and sufficient basis for addressing claims by religious minorities in Canada?

2. **Racism and discrimination**
   Another theme raised in all the regional reports concerns the necessity of maintaining, and indeed enhancing, the commitment to the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. Several more specific research questions were raised under this heading, but three in particular deserve mention: (a) the need to explore the link between racism and religious intolerance, and in particular how anti-Muslim prejudice is reinforcing and transforming older forms of racism; (b) the need to explore the role of the media in either fighting or reinforcing stereotypes, and to identify appropriate strategies for addressing hate speech; and (c) the need to explore how multiculturalism can contribute to the Action Plan Against Racism.

3. **Labour market integration**
   A third theme raised in all the reports concerns the need to better understand the obstacles to labour market integration for immigrants and second-generation visible and religious minorities. Among the more specific research questions raised under this heading, I would highlight (a) the need to better understand (and identify) discrimination in the labour market; and (b) the need to better understand the role of language competencies (and language training) in enabling or restricting economic integration.

4. **Immigration beyond the metropolis**
   A fourth theme that recurs in all the regional reports concerns the need for more research on immigration outside of the big cities. To be sure, the vast bulk of immigration will continue to go into the main metropolitan centres in Canada, and Canada is a world leader in research on urban immigration, in part through the network of Metropolis research centres. But there are many immigrants outside these metropolitan areas, and several provinces are committed to increasing the flow of immigrants to smaller cities, towns and rural areas. More research is needed to see

what enables smaller communities to attract and retain immigrants, and what role multiculturalism can play in building "welcoming" communities. Among the more specific questions raised under this heading were research on (a) immigrants in rural areas; (b) the multicultural needs of temporary skilled migrants in the North; and (c) supporting immigration to francophone minority communities.

5. **Implications of security issues for multiculturalism**
   As I noted earlier, all the reports acknowledged the increased salience of security issues in Canada, and their potential negative impact on attitudes and practices of multiculturalism. They all worried that heightened security fears raised by the "war on terrorism" could lead to the unfair stigmatization of particular groups. However, the authors differed on how best to approach this difficult issue.

   For some, the best response was to sharply separate debates on multiculturalism from debates on national security, and hence not to include issues of security as a research theme for multiculturalism. Others, however, recommended that the best way to prevent security issues from distorting multiculturalism was precisely to make this linkage a matter of explicit research.

   For example, we need to study (a) whether ethnic relations in Canada are becoming "securitized" – that is, to what extent (and in what contexts) are the behaviour and attitudes of people and institutions toward members of visible and religious minorities changing to follow a logic of (in)security rather than a logic of multicultural inclusion? What is the effect of such changes on processes of integration?; and (b) in what ways are the members of ethnic and religious groups engaged in foreign conflicts involving their co-ethnics and co-religionists? When are they involved as peacemakers, helping to diffuse Canadian values of peace, democracy and human rights? When are they involved in supporting violence or other forms of radicalism that obstruct peace and democracy? How have these forms of diasporic involvement with "homeland" conflicts changed over the years? After all, the idea that particular minorities are a source of security fears has a long history in Canada, and situating the current fears in the context of this longer history might help provide some perspective, and useful lessons.

6. **The future of multiculturalism**
   A sixth theme raised in all the regional reports concerns the long-term prognosis for multiculturalism in Canada. Multiculturalism is widely seen as having made an important contribution to Canada over the past 37 years, but both the domestic and international circumstances are changing, and we need to keep these big-picture trends in mind.

   Here again, several more specific research questions were raised under this heading. They include (a) the emergence of "super-diversity" in which ethnic and religious diversity no longer arises primarily or exclusively from permanently settled citizens, but also from growing numbers of people with various legal statuses and degrees of attachment and residence, ranging from highly mobile globe-trotting professionals to

unskilled migrant workers on repeat temporary work permits. What does multiculturalism mean in this context?; and (b) the impact of international debates and trends regarding multiculturalism on the situation in Canada. There is a clear backlash against multiculturalism in several countries around the world, most notably in Western Europe, but also arguably in the U.S. and Australia.

As I discussed in the first section, these international debates have exerted a strong, if often distorting, effect on Canadian debates, and such influences are inevitable in our globalized world. It is important, therefore, to research the specificity of the Canadian experience in relation to other countries, and to try to identify when the experience of other countries does or does not provide important lessons for our future.

These first six themes were extensively discussed in all the regional reports (although, as just noted, not all recommended including security issues as a separate theme), and hence can be seen as truly pan-Canadian in their scope. The remaining four themes were not singled out in all the reports, but they were highlighted in two or more of the six reports, and I believe they raise issues of national importance.

7. **Relating multiculturalism to Aboriginal peoples**
   One issue that was emphasized in the two Western reports concerns the relationship between multiculturalism and Aboriginal peoples. As I noted in the first section, multiculturalism in Canada generally operates in a different legal and political "silo" from Aboriginal issues, which are governed by separate laws and constitutional provisions, and administered by separate government departments. Yet, as the regional reports from the Prairies and British Columbia discuss, the two issues are inextricably linked on the ground in many parts of the country.

   Two contexts in particular were mentioned: (a) In Prairie urban settings, immigrants and Aboriginal peoples increasingly live in close proximity in various neighbourhoods, and while constitutionally speaking they may fall under different laws and regulations, the practical reality is that they often share public services and public space. We therefore need more research on how the sorts of well-established multiculturalism policies that were initially designed for foreign-born ethnic groups and visible minorities can be adapted to serve the needs of urban Aboriginal peoples; and (b) In the North, we sometimes have the opposite situation of well-established programs for Aboriginal peoples, including Aboriginal self-government rights, but relatively few multiculturalism programs available for religious and visible minorities. In this context, Aboriginal leaders have sometimes viewed attempts at promoting multiculturalism with suspicion, seeing these as a way of watering down their hard-won rights.

   So we need more research on how multiculturalism can operate within a northern context that is historically shaped by Aboriginal rights and Aboriginal self-government. While these two contexts are distinctive to the West, I believe they also raise more general issues of national importance about how we understand the links between different dimensions of diversity in Canada.

8. Vulnerable groups: Women and youth/second generation

As I noted earlier, several of the regional reports suggested replacing the broad research theme of "social inclusion" with more focused themes that examine specific patterns of exclusion. Two groups in particular were seen as vulnerable to exclusion – women and youth/second generation – and several reports recommended devoting research themes to them.

Here again, a number of more specific research questions were raised. In relation to youth and the second generation, these included research on (a) whether the declining economic attainment of newer immigrants is being passed down to their children (i.e., whether the second generation is exhibiting declines in education, employment and income); (b) whether the risks of social exclusion are leading to lower feelings of belonging and identification with Canada; and (c) whether more specific programs are needed to help youth at risk.

In relation to women, the more specific questions included research on (a) the socio-economic integration of women from visible and religious minorities; (b) women's access to language learning; (c) protecting gender equality within ethnic and religious minorities; and (d) enabling a greater participation of women from visible and religious minorities in civic and political life.

9. Patterns of ethnic community formation

One of the hot-button issues mentioned in several regional reports was "residential segregation" or "ethnic ghettoization." As I explained in the first section, and as several of the reports also discussed, the public rhetoric on ghettoization is highly misleading. However, as the reports from Ontario and Quebec suggest, the very fact that the public debate on these issues was so misleading is itself evidence of an important lacuna in our research. We simply do not have sufficient evidence about the nature and structure of ethnic community formations in Canada, or how they have changed over time. We know basic census data about patterns of residential concentration, but we do not know the institutional structures that exist within these communities, such as ethnic media, religious organizations, financial organizations, recreational organizations, educational organizations, political and advocacy organizations, and so on.

Sociologists have long argued that members of immigrant groups are more likely to successfully integrate if their communities have a robust set of such institutions, and recent studies comparing Canada and the U.S. confirm this theory.[7] Indeed, Bloemraad argues that the success of Canadian multiculturalism is precisely tied up with the fact that it has helped to build and sustain the institutional infrastructure of ethnic groups. However, we do not have an "institutional mapping" of ethnic groups, and hence do not know whether ethnic groups today are able to maintain this degree of institutional complexity. Nor are we able to determine the ways in which particular forms of ethnic community institutionalization can sometimes impede integration.

The media are full of wild speculation both on the nature of ethnic community formations and on the alleged negative effects of ghettoization on integration. Research that attempts to map ethnic community formation in Canada and relate it to broader patterns of integration could help inform both public debate and public policy.

10. Multicultural readiness in service delivery

Finally, several of the reports highlighted the issue of "multicultural readiness." As I mentioned earlier, given the widespread publicity surrounding the release of the 2006 census data, it is no longer necessary to send Canadians a wake-up call about the emerging demographic trends. Rather, what is needed is further research on the sorts of reforms that will be required if public institutions are to be ready to deal with the increasing diversity of Canadian society.

In some contexts, such as education, the issue of "multicultural readiness" is a long-standing one, at least in the big cities, and one could argue that public schools already have built-in procedures for adapting to an ever-changing student population. But in other fields, such as health care, a new and more concerted investment in multicultural readiness may be required.

One particular issue that was raised in the reports concerns care for the elderly. While immigrants from non-traditional source countries began to arrive in large numbers in the late 1960s and 1970s, they are only now beginning to form a large percentage of the elderly in Canada, and there is good reason to believe that our system of elder care, seniors' homes, hospitals and hospices is not fully prepared for the challenges this situation will raise. This is just one example, and one could imagine embarking on a more systematic "audit" of the multicultural readiness of various public institutions.

These ten themes do not encompass all the issues raised in the 48 proposals of the six regional reports. However, I believe that they capture the heart of the concerns underlying all the reports, and that they identify a set of issues that truly are essential for the future of multiculturalism in Canada.

Table: Proposed Research Topics, by Theme

N.B.: Some reports endorsed the continued use of some or all of the research themes from 2006–2008 while also suggesting new themes for 2008–2010. Other reports attempted to incorporate the earlier themes within their proposals for 2008–2010. In the former case, endorsement of the earlier themes is indicated by "(2006)."

	Atlantic	Quebec	Ontario	Man./Sask.
1. Religion	Religious diversity and integration	Integration of religious minorities	Religion (2006)	Integration of religious minorities
2. Racism, anti-racism and the media	Racism and discrimination (2006)	Racism and discrimination/ media	Racism and discrimination/ media	Racism and discrimination (2006)
3. Labour market integration	Social inclusion/ exclusion[8] (2006)	Labour market integration/ poverty	Social inclusion/ exclusion (2006)	Social inclusion/ exclusion (2006)
4. Immigration outside major cities	Immigration to rural/French communities	Regionalization within Quebec	Regional issues (rural/northern)	Minorities in rural/northern/ French areas
5. Security issues	Security in a pluralistic society (2006)	Security in a pluralistic society (2006)	Security in a pluralistic society (2006)	Security in a pluralistic society (2006)
6. Future of multiculturalism	Future of (post)-multiculturalism[9] (2006)	Future of (post)-multiculturalism (2006)	Multiculturalism for the 21st century	Future of (post)-multiculturalism (2006)
7. Multiculturalism and Aboriginal peoples				Relations with Prairie Aboriginals
8. Vulnerable groups	Youth	Youth/elderly/ women		Women
9. Ethnic community structures			Institutional self-sufficiency of ethnic groups	Public performances of identity
10. Service delivery	Health			
11. Other	Data gathering	(1) Language competence (2) Quebec's specificity	Public perception of multiculturalism	Protecting historic heritage

Table (continued): Proposed Research Topics, by Theme

	Alberta	Territories	B.C.	CANADA
1. Religion	Religion and inclusion		Religion (2006)	**Adopting multiculturalism for religious diversity**
2. Racism, anti-racism and the media	Strategies for tackling racism and discrimination		Racism and discrimination/ Canada's Action Plan Against Racism	**Racism and discrimination**
3. Labour market integration	Economic participation	Labour market migration	Economic participation	**Labour market integration**
4. Immigration outside major cities		(This applies to the region as a whole)		**Immigration beyond the metropolis**
5. Security issues	Security in a pluralistic society (2006)		International geopolitics: Implications for multiculturalism	**Implications of security issues for multiculturalism**
6. Future of multiculturalism	Future of multiculturalism policy		Multiculturalism: Future policy evolutions	**The future of multiculturalism**
7. Multiculturalism and Aboriginal peoples	Relation to Aboriginal populations	Coordination with Aboriginal initiatives		**Relating multiculturalism to Aboriginal peoples**
8. Vulnerable groups	Youth/seniors		Youth at risk	**Vulnerable groups: Women and youth**
9. Ethnic community structures				**Patterns of ethnic community formation**
10. Service delivery	Health		Multiculturalism in service delivery	**Multicultural readiness in service delivery**
11. Other		Data collection	Engagement with 2010 Olympics	

References

Adams, Michael, 2007. *Unlikely Utopia: The Surprising Triumph of Canadian Pluralism* (Viking, Toronto).

Banting, Keith G., Thomas J. Courchene and F. Leslie Seidle, eds., 2007. *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Berry, J.W., R. Kalin and D. Taylor, 1977. *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada* (Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa).

Berry, John, et al., 2006. *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition* (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah).

Bird, Karen, 2004. "Obstacles to Ethnic Minority Representation in Local Government in Canada." In Caroline Andrew, ed., *Our Diverse Cities* (Ottawa: Metropolis and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities).

Bird, Karen, 2005. "The Political Representation of Visible Minorities in Electoral Democracies: A Comparison of France, Denmark, and Canada," *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11:4: 425–465.

Bird, Karen, 2007. "Patterns of Substantive Representation Among Visible Minority MPs: Evidence from Canada's House of Commons" (prepared for the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Helsinki, May 7–12, 2007).

Black, Jerome, and Erickson, Lynda, 2006. "Ethno-Racial Origins of Candidates and Electoral Performance," *Party Politics*, vol. 12/4: 541–561.

Bliss, Michael, 2006. "Has Canada Failed?" *Literary Review of Canada*, 14/2: 3–6.

Bloemraad, Irene, 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Cantle Report, 2001. *Community Cohesion: Report of the Independent Review Team*. Chaired by Ted Cantle (Home Office, London).

Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers, 2008. "White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue" (CM 2008 30, May 2, 2008).

Dasko, Donna, 2005. "Public Attitudes Towards Multiculturalism and Bilingualism in Canada." In Margaret Adsett, Caroline Mallandain and Shannon Stettner, eds., *Canadian and French Perspectives on Diversity: Conference Proceedings.* <dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/CH36-4-1-2004E.pdf> October 16, 2003 (Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage, March 2007).

Esses, Victoria, et al., 2006. "Perceptions of National Identity and Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration in Canada and Germany," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 30: 653–669.

Focus Canada, 2006. *Canadians' Attitudes Toward Muslims* (Environics).

Goodhart, David, 2008. "Has Multiculturalism Had Its Day?" *Literary Review of Canada*, vol. 16/3: 3–4.

Gregg, Allan, 2006. "Identity Crisis: Multiculturalism: A Twentieth-Century Dream Becomes a Twenty-First Century Conundrum," *The Walrus*, vol. 3/2 (March 2006).

Hiebert, Daniel, Nadine Schuurman and Heather Smith, 2007. "Multiculturalism on the Ground: The Social Geography of Immigrant and Visible Minority Populations in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver" (Working paper #07-12, RIIM, Metropolis British Columbia).

Howard-Hassmann, Rhoda, 2003. *Compassionate Canadians: Civic Leaders Discuss Human Rights* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Howe, Paul, 2007. "The Political Engagement of New Canadians: A Comparative Perspective." In Keith G. Banting, Thomas J. Courchene and F. Leslie Seidle, eds., *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy).

Joppke, Christian, 2007. "Immigrants and Civic Integration in Western Europe." In Keith G. Banting, Thomas J. Courchene and F. Leslie Seidle, eds., *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy), 321–350.

Keeble, Edna, 2005. "Immigration, Civil Liberties, and National/Homeland Security: A Comparison Between Canada and the United States," *International Journal*, vol. 60/2 (Spring): 359–372.

Kesler, Christel, and Irene Bloemraad, 2008. "Does Immigration Erode Social Capital?" (paper presented at annual meeting of CPSA, June 2008).

Koopmans, Ruud, Marco Guigni and Florence Passy, 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe* (University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota).

Kymlicka, Will, 2007. "Tester les limites du multiculturalisme libéral? Le cas des tribunaux en droit familial," *Éthique publique*, vol. 9/1, pp. 27–39.

Kymlicka, Will, 2007b. "Ethnocultural Diversity in a Liberal State: Making Sense of the Canadian Model(s)." In Keith Banting, Thomas Courchene and Leslie Seidle (eds), *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Institute for Research on Public Policy, Montreal), 39–86.

Kymlicka, Will, 2008. "The Three Lives of Multiculturalism," delivered as 2008 UBC-Laurier Institution Multiculturalism Lecture, Vancouver, May 2008.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2006. *Where Immigrant Students Succeed: A Comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in PISA 2003* (OECD, Program for International Student Assessment).

Phillips, Trevor, 2005. "After 7/7: Sleepwalking to Segregation" (Commission for Racial Equality: www.cre.gov.uk).

Qadeer, Mohammad, and Sandeep Kumar, 2006. "Ethnic Enclaves and Social Cohesion," *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, vol. 15/2: 1–17.

Reitz, Jeffrey, and Rupa Banerjee, 2007. "Racial Inequality, Social Cohesion and Policy Issues in Canada." In Keith Banting, Thomas J. Courchene and F. Leslie Seidle, eds., *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy).

Sides, John, and Jack Citrin, 2007. "European Opinion About Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information," *British Journal of Political Science*, 37: 477–504.

Sniderman, Paul, and Louk Hagendoorn, 2007. *When Ways of Life Collide: Multiculturalism and Its Discontents in the Netherlands* (Princeton University Press, Princeton).

Soroka, Stuart, Richard Johnston and Keith Banting, 2007. "Ties That Bind: Social Cohesion and Diversity in Canada." In Keith Banting, Thomas J. Courchene and F. Leslie Seidle, eds., *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Montreal: Institute for Research in Public Policy).

Walks, Allan, and Larry Bourne, 2006. "Ghettos in Canada's Cities? Racial Segregation, Ethnic Enclaves and Poverty Concentrations in Canadian Urban Areas," *Canadian Geographer*, vol. 50/3: 273–297.

Weldon, Steven, 2006. "The Institutional Context of Tolerance for Ethnic Minorities: A Comparative Multilevel Analysis of Western Europe," *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 50/2: 331–349.

Wikan, Unni, 2002. *Generous Betrayal: Politics of Culture in the New Europe* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago).

Endnotes

[1] The six reports were written by Ibrahim Ouattara (Atlantic); Annick Lenoir and Paul Morin (Quebec); David Seljak (Ontario); Paul Bramadat (Manitoba and Saskatchewan); and Lauren Hunter (British Columbia and Alberta/Territories).

[2] These polls also reveal that 74% of Canadians think that multiculturalism is a cornerstone of Canadian culture; 82% agree that multiculturalism is a source of pride for Canadians; and 83% agree that people from different racial and cultural groups are enriching the cultural life of Canada (Environics, Focus Canada, 2002).

[3] For one of the few serious attempts to test multiculturalism's role in these trends, see Koopmans, Guigni and Passy 2005. Unfortunately, their analysis depends on a particular reading of the Dutch case. I raise some doubts about their analysis in my review of Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2007 (which makes the same mistake).

[4] Original in French.

[5] Original in French.

[6] Alberta and the Territories were covered in the same regional report, but the author divided the two areas for the purposes of identifying research themes, and I have followed her listing here.

[7] See, for example, Irene Bloemraad, *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2006.

[8] The research theme "Social inclusion/exclusion" from 2006–2008 covered a number of domains, not just labour market inclusion. While some of the regional authors felt that this theme was too broad, they all endorsed a continued research focus on issues of labour market inclusion/exclusion.

[9] Several authors argued that the research theme "Racism, discrimination and post-multiculturalism" from 2006–2008 should be divided into two separate themes: one on racism/discrimination, and one on the future of (post)-multiculturalism.